

A N

EXAMINATION

O F A

DISCOURSE OR SERMON

Published by

DANIEL DOBEL

of Cranbrook in Kent,

On the SUBJECT of

WATER-BAPTISM.

With *Remarks* on his *Preface* to the same.

By one of the People called QUAKERS.

*He that is first in his own Cause seemeth just, but his
Neighbour cometh and searcheth him, Prov. xviii. 17.*

L O N D O N :

Printed and Sold by T. SOWLE RAYLTON and
LUKE HINDE, at the *Bible* in *George-Yard*,
Lombard-Street, MDCCXLIV.

[Price Four-pence]

T H E
P R E F A C E.

Friendly Reader !

I submit to thy Perusal the following Pages without much Preamble : They are occasioned by the Preface to a Discourse lately published on the Subject of Water-Baptism, by one Daniel Dobel, a Preacher among the Baptists at Cranbrook in Kent : An Author who seems to have kept his Work by him a considerable Time unpublish'd, for want of a Reason to give the World why it should be made publick at all. At length, full of himself, and opinionated of his own Performance, rather than it should lie longer dormant, he pretends Occasion where none was intended for its Publication. As he has introduced that Pretence by misrepresenting Matters

in his Preface, I have thought proper to shew wherein he has done it : And as he has offer'd his Discourse to the serious Consideration of the People called Quakers, as One of them, I have thought meet to make some Observations thereupon : In the Perusal of which, if thou shalt find any thing conducive to thy Benefit or Information, my End in publishing it will be so far answered, who am

Thy real Christian Friend

J. B.

A N
EXAMINATION
O F
DANIEL DOBEL's Discourse
O N
WATER-BAPTISM.

I N making mine Observations on the Pamphlet now before me, I shall follow the Author in his own Method, by considering, *first*, his Preface, and *afterwards*, the Discourse it self.

His Preface begins thus, “ When I first offer’d
“ this Discourse, of which the following is the Sub-
“ stance ; I had not any Thoughts that I should
“ commit it to the Press ; neither had I any Notes
“ to help me in compiling it for Print, it being not
“ my Method to make Use of any ; therefore I do
“ not pretend ’tis exactly the same for Words, tho’
“ I believe there is no material Difference, only
“ some short Additions.”

Answ. It seems, he once preach’d a Sermon, tho’ he neither tells *When* nor *Where*, somewhat like this *Discourse*, but not the same : His acknowledged *Additions* shew that, which, tho’ he calls *short*, no Man else can tell *how long* : Some *Omissions* too, he must

must admit, may have been, or his *Memory* will appear very *extraordinary*. Wherefore his Publishing this Performance, under the Name of a Sermon preached without Notes, seems to proceed from his Ambition of appearing a Man of fine Parts, and a Preacher *extempore*, of what indeed he has composed with Pains and Premeditation. Plain Truth would have become him better than such Pretences.

The Occasion he assigns for publishing his Discourse is also feigned, some Part of his Manuscript having been seen long before that Occasion happened: Nor was there really such Occasion given as he pretends, when he says,

Preface Pag. 3. “ In “ *October* 1741, I was at
 “ a Funeral of one of the People called *Quakers*—
 “ at the solemnizing of whose Funeral there was a
 “ great deal of good Advice offer’d to the Com-
 “ pany by several Persons, very suitable to the
 “ Occasion: But amongst other Things, one of
 “ them declared against *Water-Baptism*, or any *Ex-*
 “ *ternal Ordinances* to be observed under the Gospel
 “ Dispensation; and to this Controversy he gave a
 “ publick Challenge, even to all, both learned
 “ and unlearned; at the hearing of which, I was
 “ somewhat surprized, and do conclude it was not
 “ a prudent Step, especially at such a Time: How-
 “ ever I was resolved to accept of the Challenge.”

Ans. That there was such a Funeral, and that *Daniel Dobel* was at it, is admitted; also that good Advice was there offer’d to the Company is granted; some of which Advice was, “ *That People*
 “ *would beware of resting in a bare Form of Religion,*
 “ *it being possible to be very exact in the Observation of*
 “ *Rites and Performance of Ceremonies, and yet be*
 “ *Strangers to the Life and Power of Godliness.*”
 Wherefore

Wherefore those Preachers did press their Hearers to Labour after the Knowledge of the Inward and Spiritual Baptism, which purifies the Heart, and is the ONE BAPTISM joined by the Apostle with ONE LORD and ONE FAITH : Which is indeed truly saving, but the Outward Baptism with Water was not saving, and therefore not the Baptism of Christ. And One of those Preachers, speaking somewhat earnestly on this Subject, exprest these Words, viz. “ I dare challenge “ all the learned Rabbies on Earth to prove that “ *Water-Baptism* is efficacious to Salvation.” These were the *Quakers* real Words, which, as then generally exprest, did not carry with them the Appearance of a Challenge to any personal or particular Disputation ; nor did the Person, who exprest them, desire any Debate or Controversy in the Case, for he very well knows, that the World is already too full of Controversy about Things which profit not : Nor indeed did other Persons, who were present at the said Funeral, take the Words spoken in any such Sense, as may appear by the following Certificate, viz.

“ We whose Names are hereunto subscribed,
 “ having been present at the Funeral, mentioned
 “ in the *Preface* to a Sermon lately published by
 “ *Daniel Dobel*, do hereby certify, that to the
 “ best of our Knowledge and Remembrance, the
 “ Words then spoken by One of the *Quakers* who
 “ preached there, and which the said *Daniel Dobel*
 “ calls a Challenge, were no other than what are
 “ related in the foregoing Account of them, viz.
 “ *I dare challenge all the learned Rabbies on Earth to*
 “ *prove that Water-Baptism is efficacious to Salva-*
 “ *tion :*” Which Words seemed to us no more than
 “ the said Preacher’s earnest Assertion of the Matter
 “ he was speaking of, nor did we understand the
 “ same as any intended Provocation or Challenge
 “ to

“ to a Dispute on that Point : And, we apprehend,
 “ that the said *Daniel Dobel*’s professing to take
 “ them in that Sense, proceeded from his own Forwardness to engage in Talk, and his Desire of
 “ an Opportunity to publish his Sermon in Print.
 “ Witness our Hands this third Day of the Month
 “ called *October*, 1743.”

Sherlock Thorp,

Samuel Baker,

John Pay,

Henry Sims.

’Tis also observable, that this Author hath by several Ways perverted the plain Sense of the Words spoken ; for the Words themselves being only relative to *Water-Baptism*, he has added other Words of his own, *viz. or any external Ordinances to be observed under the Gospel Dispensation* : An Addition not only unjust, but inconsistent with the *Quaker*’s Practice at that very Time, he being then exercised in *Preaching*, which he owns to be *an External Ordinance to be observed under the Gospel Dispensation* : He was also at that Time assembled with his Friends for the Performance of Religious Worship, which Act of so Assembling, he also acknowledges to be *an External Ordinance to be observed under the Gospel Dispensation*. So that the *Quaker*’s known Practice is such, as admits not the Use of any such Expression as in this Case *Daniel Dobel* hath invented and added to his Words.

2d. By adding to what he calls a *Challenge* the Word *Unlearned*, he has perverted the plain Sense to make the Expression fit his Purpose, for as the Words expressed were the *Learned Rabbies*, ’twould have been ridiculous in a Man of his Size for Learning to have claimed any Concern therein.

3d. By

3d. By using the Term *this Controversy*, to signify not only the Subject of *Water-Baptism*, but to include also his own Addition of other Terms.

4th. By saying, "He gave a publick Challenge," when as the Person Preaching had no Intention of raising any Debate or Controversy at all.

And indeed, no Controversy had probably been on this Occasion, had not *Daniel Dobel's* Itch of appearing in Print prompted him to lay hold on any Pretence for so doing ; for when he had been at the Funeral he mentions, and after the Evening's Conversation he speaks of, he told one or more of his Acquaintance, *that he would make use of that as an Opportunity to introduce what he had written* : And when it was answered, *He could not fairly do that*, he reply'd, *I will do it* : This is asserted by one that had it from his Friend's own Mouth.

His Pretence of a *Challenge*, as the Occasion of his Conference with the *Quaker*, seems confuted by himself, when he assigns another Occasion long before, "We had, *says he*, concluded at *Canterbury* some Years ago to have Discourse on this Subject." 'Tis true, that he had formerly at *Canterbury* discoursed with the same *Quaker* on the Subject of *Water-Baptism*, and in that Conference did acknowledge that *Water-Baptism* was *not saving* : A Concession at which he afterwards expressed some Uneasiness, and signified to some of his Acquaintance, that the *Quaker* was too hard for him : So that the real Cause of his seeking another Conference with the *Quaker* probably was, to try whether he could gain any Advantage to retrieve his Loss at *Canterbury*.

The Account he gives of the Conference is not candid, for he has not fairly stated either the *Quaker's* Questions, or his own Answers : However, he goes on, and says,

Preface, pag. 4, 5. “ My Antagonist was still
 “ full of Questions, such as these, Whether *Water-*
 “ *Baptism* could save Men? And whether Persons
 “ might not come under *Water-Baptism*, and other
 “ External Forms, and yet be in a bad State? And,
 “ whether there might not be a great many that
 “ would be happy in another World, and yet be
 “ such as never were Baptized with Water? To
 “ all which, *says he*, I answered to this Purpose,
 “ That as to the *First*, I said, I did not believe Bap-
 “ tism of it self could save Men; but yet I did
 “ take it to be an Appointment of God, and as
 “ such it was a Way or Means leading to that
 “ End : And, as to the *Second*, I said, I did think,
 “ that there was many that passed under the Ex-
 “ ternals of Religion, and yet were in a very bad
 “ Condition, and I instanced the Case of *Simon*
 “ *Magus* : And, as to the *Third*, I told him, that
 “ it was not my Business to judge, but yet my
 “ Charity led me to think, that there might and
 “ would be many happy hereafter, that never
 “ were baptized with Water.”

He seems offended, pag. 5, that from his Answers 'twas inferred, that “ he had given away his
 “ Cause,” and yet that Inference appears but just ;
 for since by *Baptism*, he must mean *Water-Bap-*
tism, his acknowledging that *it cannot save Men* ;
 that *those who pass under it may yet be in a very*
bad Condition ; and that *those who have it not, may*
nevertheless be happy hereafter, is in Effect a giving
 up his Cause, which was to prove *Water-Baptism*
Efficacious to Salvation, by granting the very Con-
 trary. His saying, “ I did take it (*Water-Baptism*)
 “ to

(II)

“ to be an Appointment of God,” is no more than he might have said of *Circumcision* ; for that also was of God’s Appointment : Yet, as *Circumcision*, so *Water-Baptism*, was but Temporary, as all the legal Rites among the *Jews* were, and therefore not to be perpetuated under the Gospel Dispensation.

Preface, pag. 5. “ I desired I might lay down
“ my Argument for *Water-Baptism*, and that he
“ would give me a direct Answer ; upon which he
“ seemed content : Accordingly I went on untill I
“ had done without Interruption.”

This shews a great deal of Patience and Condescension in the Persons present, who could bear with the long Discourse of a Man so talkative.

“ He indeed told me, (adds the Relater) that he
“ had not well enough considered the Text on which
“ I grounded my Argument, to give an Answer
“ to it immediately : I told him, if he pleased I
“ would look it ; but he said, It would be to little
“ Purpose, for he perceived we should not understand it alike.”

Answer. When *Daniel* had ended his Talk, he urged the *Quaker* to give his Judgment on what he had been saying, but the *Quaker* declined it, and having no Inclination to enter into Argument again at that Time, modestly replied, *I have not so considered the Text thou hast mentioned, as to give thee much Answer to it at present.*

The Substance of the Argument he talks so much of, seems to be contained in what follows, viz.

Preface, pag. 5, 6. “ I told him, that it was
“ very evident, that the Apostle, who was then
B 2 “ under

“ under the immediate Influence of the Spirit of
 “ God, did in that Passage recommend to the
 “ Heart-prick’d *Jews*, two Duties, *viz. Repentance*
 “ and *Baptism*, and annexed two Promises as En-
 “ couragements to engage them to the Practice
 “ thereof, which were, the Remission of Sin, and
 “ the Gift of the *Holy Ghost* ; and that the Baptism
 “ there recommended by the Spirit of God, was
 “ distinguish’d from the Baptism or Gift of the *Holy*
 “ *Ghost*, and that therefore it was the Baptism of
 “ Water there intended. *Acts* ii. 38.”

Answ. The Words of that Text are, *Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost.* This Text makes no Mention at all of Water, nor does the Context necessarily infer it. The Word, *Repent*, denotes a Sorrow of Heart ; and the Words, *be Baptized*, may denote the purifying or cleansing of the Heart, whereby it is effectually converted or turned to the Lord : Now those who are thus purified or cleansed, and their Hearts effectually converted or turned to the Lord, are fitly prepared and qualified to receive the Gift of the *Holy Ghost*. And to put this Matter out of all Doubt, the same Apostle *Peter* in the next Chapter, Verse 19. thus explains his own Meaning, saying there, *Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out, when the Times of Refreshing shall come from the Presence of the Lord.* And what are the *Times of Refreshing* but the *Times of Receiving* the Gift of the Holy Spirit ? In a Word, these two Texts vary in *Terms*, but have one and the same Meaning. Let therefore the Apostle’s own Construction of the Words, *be Baptized*, take Place, and instead thereof read, *Be converted*, as in the parallel Text is expressed, and the

the Relater's Triumph upon this Text will be found of no Force.

The Relater again pag. 6. repeats his Misrepresentation of what he calls the *Quaker's* Challenge, meerly for a Cover to his own insolent Boasting in saying, "*I Challenge all the QUAKERS,*" Words, which, as they mention not what he challenges them to do, are only expressive of his own Weakness and Vain-Glory.

He gives also, pag. 6. an artful Turn to his Story, apt to deceive his Reader into an Opinion that the *Quaker* prompted him to appear in Print; whereas it was his own Saying first, that he had Thoughts of Printing somewhat on the Subject discours'd of, which caused the *Quaker* to reply, *If thou dost, I doubt not but thou wilt be answered.*

His Profession of Writing "with a Christian Spirit," and of a "Concern for the Religious Welfare of the *Quakers*," I think to be but Words.

Hitherto the Relater has endeavoured to mislead his Readers, but toward the Conclusion of his Preface has misled himself, when he calls *William Dell* an eminent *Quaker*, who indeed never was one called a *Quaker*; but being a sincere Enquirer after Truth, and, as he declares concerning himself, "resolved to lay down whatsoever he had before
"entertained touching this Point, (*viz.* the Doctrine of Baptisms) and to come to the plain and
"manifest Scriptures, and from thence (after
"much seeking God) to learn whatsoever the Lord
"should be pleased to teach him, chusing rather
"to build on the clear Word throughout, than
"on any uncertain Inferences and blind Conjectures
"of Men," he became enabled to discover the
Truth

Truth in this Point, and to explain the *Doctrine of Baptisms* with a convincing Evidence and Clearness: That his Sentiments in this Case were the same with those of the *Quakers*, hath so happened, by his and their Enquiries being alike regulated by the Testimony of the Holy Scriptures, and the Illumination of the Holy Spirit by which they were dictated.

So that this Author's Recommendation of *William Dell's* Advice to the *Quakers* is superfluous, they having been always in the Practice of it. And 'tis a Confirmation of their Doctrine in this Point, that so enlightened a Man, not of their Perswasion in other Matters, has born so clear a Testimony thereunto.

Having thus gone through the Relater's *Preface*, and as I suppose, sufficiently discovered his Design therein, we are next to consider the *Discourse* or *Sermon* it self, which he makes on

LUKE XXIV. 49.

And behold I send the Promise of my Father upon you: But tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem, untill ye be endued with Power from on high.

IN his Discourse upon this Text he undertakes to manifest, that *Water-Baptism* is an Ordinance of the Gospel Church. In order to which, 'tis observable, that he makes Choice of a Text which has not any Relation to his Subject, and wherein nothing is either mentioned or intended concerning *Water-Baptism*. His Reason for that Choice we see not, unless perhaps his *Ambition* was, that the Proof of his Point might not depend on the Text, but on
his

his own Abilities, which, we suppose, no Man values more than he that has them.

His Sermon begins thus, “ The Knowledge of
“ the Will of God and our Duty, is certainly a
“ Matter of Moment to all, and especially to *Us*,
“ whom he hath been graciously pleased to favour
“ with the Means of attaining it.”

In this he represents the Knowledge of God’s Will and our Duty, as a Matter of *Universal* Concern, but restricts the Means of attaining that Knowledge as a *peculiar* Favour granted only to some, whom he distinguishes by the Word, *Us*, to include himself among the Favourites. Does the Man indeed think that the Knowledge of Universal Duty is not universally communicated? Or will he, in Defiance of Holy Scripture, represent God as a *Respecter of Persons*, granting to some, and withholding from others, the Means of knowing their Duty? Thus in his first setting out he expresses the Narrowness and Partiality of his Sentiments, and plainly shews that his Judgment is not directed by the Influence of that *Universal Charity*, which the Spirit of true Christianity inspires, and which the Gospel of Christ exhibits to all Mankind.

His next Attempt is to describe two Setts of Duties, *viz. Moral Duties*, and *Positive Duties*. His Words are “ It’s Matter of Moment to us not only
“ to acquaint ourselves with the *Moral* Duties,
“ but those of a *Positive* Nature also.” These Terms of Distinction he found not in the New-Testament; they are either of his own Coining or borrowed of other Men. Had the Distinction it self been a Doctrine of Christianity, he might have expressed it in plain Scripture Words, which are ever sufficient for that Purpose; but ’tis a Sign that forward Men are obtruding upon others their own
Erroneous

Erroneous Notions, when they are oblig'd to invent *Terms* to utter them in.

He acknowledges, that 'tis "not to be known
" by the Light of Nature or Reason of Mankind,
" that *Water-Baptism* is a Duty under this Dispen-
" sation."

In this he either understands not what he says, or gives up his Cause ; for, whatsoever is a Duty, may be known by the Reason of Mankind to be so. Divine Revelation it self is a Discovery made by the Spirit of God to the Reason of Man : *Revealed Duty* is that which is so made known to the Reason of *Man* to be his Duty. And it would perhaps puzzle a wiser Man than this Sermon-Writer, to demonstrate, how any Thing can be a Man's Duty, which is not discoverable to his Reason to be so : Till he does that, we must think him rash and unadvised in thus plunging himself beyond his Depth.

He talks of " the Doctrine and Practice of Christ
" and his inspired Apostles," but proves not that Christ either taught or practised *Water-Baptism* ; and if he will persist to urge the Practice of the Apostles, who were *Jews*, as a Pattern for Christian Imitation, he may, by the same Way of Reasoning, prove *Circumcision*, *Purification*, *Shaving of the Head*, *Anointing with Oyl*, and other *Jewish Rites* by them practised, to be *Gospel Ordinances*, as well as *Water-Baptism*.

" There is indeed, (*says he*, pag. 9, 10.) in our
" Day, much Controversy concerning this Point ;
" some about the Subject and Mode of *Water-Bap-*
" *tism* ; others deny it to be a *Gospel Ordinance*."

This

This Controversy, as we apprehend, hath arisen from the unreasonable Warmth of Ignorant and Conceited Men, who neither knowing the *Gospel*, nor the *Power of God*, have greatly erred, busying and bewildering themselves about the Practice of Forms and Ceremonies not required at their Hands, while the Truth and Substance of Religion hath been too little regarded. The Variety of Opinions both about the Mode and Subjects of *Water-Baptism*, sufficiently shew, that it is not a Doctrine clearly revealed, much less a Christian Duty.

“ What a deplorable Thing it is, (says * One) to
 “ consider the Confusions that are among those
 “ who think Christianity as it were cashiered, if
 “ the Ceremony of *Water Baptism* be laid aside?
 “ Some sprinkle, others pour, and a third dip or
 “ plunge: Thus they differ about the *Mode* of
 “ *Baptism*: And then for the *Subjects* the Contention
 “ is no less: Some pleading for Infants, and adult
 “ Persons also, if not admitted to Water in their
 “ Infancy: Others for adult Persons only upon
 “ Profession of their Faith. Then for Rites or
 “ Usages either preceding, accompanying, or con-
 “ sequential to it, they are very much divided.
 “ The *Jacobites* in *Syria*, *Cyprus*, *Mesopotamia*,
 “ *Babylon*, and *Palestine*, Sign their Children be-
 “ fore *Baptism*, many in the Face, some in the
 “ Arm, with the Sign of the Cross imprinted with a
 “ Burning Iron. *Breerwood's Enquiries* pag. 153.
 “ The *Papists* use the Sign of the Cross, Gossips,
 “ Cream, Salt, Spittle, *Ephphathas*, Insufflations,
 “ in their Baptism: The Church of *England*, so
 “ called, uses the Cross and Gossips; the *Baptists*
 C “ and

* Richard Claridge (formerly a noted Teacher among the Baptists.) See his *Life and Posthumous Works*, pag. 352, 353. printed in the Year 1726.

“ and *Independents* neither. The *Jacobites* and
 “ *Cophti* use Circumcision, the former, of both Sex-
 “ es, *Ibid.* The latter give inferior Orders under
 “ Priesthood to Infants presently after Bap-
 “ tism. *Breerwood*, pag. 157. The *Papists* and Na-
 “ tional Church use Confirmation: Some *Baptists*,
 “ Imposition of Hands, and others not, upon those
 “ that are baptized.”

From this Variety of Opinions about *Water-Bap-
 tism*, and the like about the *Outward Supper*, he
 justly observes, that, “ These Diversities of Opin-
 “ ions, Modes, Ceremonies and Gestures, have
 “ sadly divided Christendom, and begat such
 “ violent Contentions, Feuds and Animosities,
 “ which have not been satisfied in some without
 “ Goals and Dungeons, and in others without Fire
 “ and Faggot. So the Spiritual Baptism and Supper
 “ have been neglected, to the great Reproach and
 “ Infamy of the Christian Religion, the lean-fleshed
 “ Kine, as in *Pharaoh's* Dream, have eaten up the
 “ fat, and the thin Ears have devoured the rank
 “ and full: Lifeless Forms being set up instead of
 “ the living Power, and the Truth and Substance
 “ postpon'd to empty Shadows and Ceremonies.”

If Christ had intended *Water-Baptism* for a stand-
 ing Ordinance in his Church, would he not have
 been exact and particular in the Institution of it?
 Would he have left it as Matter of perpetual Dis-
 pute, at *what Time*, in *what Manner*, to *whom* and
 by *whom*, it should be administered? Certainly not;
 for *God is not the Author of Confusion, but of Peace.*
 1 Cor. xiv. 33. *Daniel Dobel* himself, in a Treatise
 of his entituled *The Seventh Day Sabbath not obliga-
 tory upon Christians*, pag. 45, speaking of Circum-
 cision, saith, “ The Law of Circumcision is deliver-
 “ ed exceeding plain, both with Respect to the Law
 “ it

“ it self, and the Persons to whom, and also the Time
 “ when it should be performed.” Had *Water-Bap-*
tism been intended by Christ for a Gospel-Ordinance,
 would it not have been delivered as plain both re-
 specting the Manner, Time, and Subjects of it, as
 Circumcision was under the Law? Doubtless it
 would. And seeing it is not so, we thence naturally
 infer, that it is not an Ordinance of the Gospel, nor
 designed to be so. And if *Daniel Dobel* will abide
 by what himself in his before-mentioned Treatise
 (pag. 44, 45.) hath said, viz. “ Certainly as God is
 “ a good, wise, and just Being, he will not require
 “ any thing of Man, but what he doth in a plain
 “ expressive and intelligible Manner make known
 “ to him,” he must admit, that *Water-Baptism*,
 which is not so plainly, expressly, and intelligibly
 made known, is not required of any Man, and con-
 sequently cannot be a Christian Duty.

His saying, pag. 10, that God did, by his Son,
 “ after his Resurrection from the Dead, instruct his
 “ Servants the Apostles in those Things pertaining
 “ to his Kingdom,” is no Proof that *Water-Baptism*
 was any of those Things. Nor has our Saviour’s
 bidding his Disciples “ *tarry at Jerusalem and wait*
 “ *for the Promise of the Father*, that so they might
 “ be eminently qualified to preach the Gospel of
 “ Life and Salvation to Mankind,” any Manner of
 Relation to *Water-Baptism*: The Commandment
 given them to wait untill they were *endued with Pow-*
er from on high, plainly shews, that the Commission
 they were to execute, and the Baptism they were to
 administer, were such as could not be executed or
 administred by any Power of their own: And con-
 sequently that the *Baptism* they were commissioned
 to administer was not *Water-Baptism*; for that, this
 Author himself, pag. 11, acknowledges “ was in
 “ Man’s Power only to administer.”

He gives us, pag. 10, the Heads of his Sermon, thus,

“ *First*, I will (*says he*) observe what was the Promise of the Father spoken of in the Text.

“ *Secondly*, I will take Notice of the Accomplishment of this Promise, and what was the End of God in conferring it upon the Apostles.

“ *Thirdly*, I will observe what might be the probable Reasons why the Disciples were *to tarry at Jerusalem untill they were endued with Power from on high*.

“ *Fourthly*, I will trace the Apostles in their Doctrine and Practice, as Men eminently *endued of God with Power from on high* to teach and direct Mankind the Knowledge of their Duty in Obedience to God under this Dispensation.

“ *Fifthly*, The Application.”

We are now to observe his Manner of treating on each of these Heads, which begins, pag. 11, thus,
 “ And *first*, (*says he*) to the first of these, that is, to observe, what was the Promise of the Father spoken of in the Text: Which Words of our Lord do evidently refer to the Prophecy of *Joel* the Prophet.” Now the Promise of the Father spoken of in the Text, not only refers to the Prophecy of *Joel*, but was the very Thing there prophesied of. The Apostle *Peter* expressly declares, *This is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel*. Wherefore the *Promise of the Father*, and the *Prophecy of Joel*, being one and the same Thing, must be of one and the same Extent and Duration. The Words of *Joel's* Prophecy as rehearsed by the Apostle, *Acts* ii. 17, 18, are, *And it shall come to pass*

pass in the last Days, (saith God) I will pour out of my Spirit upon all Flesh; and your Sons and your Daughters shall Prophecie, and your Young Men shall see Visions, and your Old Men shall dream Dreams: And on my Servants and on my Hand-maidens, will I pour forth in those Days of my Spirit, and they shall Prophecie. Had the Sermon-Writer rightly considered the Words of this Prophecy, he might have observed,

1st. That by the *last Days* is here understood the Gospel Dispensation, and its Duration or Continuance to the End of Time.

2d. That the Words, *upon all Flesh*, express the Universality of the pouring forth of the Spirit, and accordingly the Apostle *Peter*, far from restricting it to the Apostles at the Day of *Pentecost*, expresses its boundless Extent, when speaking to the Men of *Judea*, and Dwellers at *Jerusalem*, he says, *The Promise is unto you and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call*, Acts. ii. 39. By which Words the Call appears to be universal to *Jews* and *Gentiles*, however distant either in Time or Place.

Wherefore those who attempt to limit the *Promise of the Father*, or, which is all one, the Prophecy of *Joel*, to the Apostles, or to “the first and apostolick Age,” have no sufficient Warrant from holy Scripture for such Limitation: Nor are the Terms *Ordinary* and *Extraordinary* to be found in *Holy-Writ*, for which Reason they may be justly laid aside, as meer Inventions of mistaken Men, to express their narrow Conceptions of the pouring forth of the Spirit of God, which is *Omnipresent, Universal, and Unlimited*.

This

This Sermon-Writer seems inconsistent with himself, when pag. 11, he says, "As God spake these Words by his Servant *Joel*, they may well be said to contain the Promise of the Father," and yet a few Lines lower says, "And this is the Thing promised by our Lord in the Text, even the *Extraordinary* Gift of the Spirit of God." His Inconsistency arises from the Use of that unscriptural Term *Extraordinary*, which we apprehend, he will not be able to reconcile with the Promise of the Father, *I will pour out of my Spirit upon all Flesh*. Does he think that the Apostles and first Ministers of the Gospel were *all Flesh*?

He tells us in the same Page, that "Our Saviour stiles the *Extraordinary* Gift of the Spirit of God, the Comforter and the Holy Ghost," and for Proof of this Assertion refers to *John* xv. 26. Not observing that of the Comforter there mentioned, 'tis expressly said in the preceding Chapter, *Verse* 16, *I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever*. The Perpetuity of which Promise clearly shews, that it could not be confined to the Persons of the Apostles, nor to their Times, but must have Relation to the Church of Christ in all future Ages.

Having thus weakly attempted to wrest the Scriptures on his first Head, he proceeds to his *Second*, viz, "*The Accomplishment of the Promise*," We have already shewn, that the promised pouring forth of the Spirit under the Gospel Dispensation was not a *peculiar* or *partial*, but a *general* and *universal* Blessing; not transient and temporary, but *perpetual*, and *to abide for ever*. Now, altho' that which is *general* may include every *particular* of the same Nature, and that which is *perpetual* may include that which is *temporary*; yet it is not to be restricted or
limited

limited thereunto. The Mistake of many in this Matter seems to arise from their not attending to the plain scriptural Distinction which is made between the *One universal* pouring forth of the Spirit, and the Diversities of its Operations, which is excellently set forth by the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. xii. where 'tis most apparent, that the *working of Miracles, Prophecy, discerning of Spirits, speaking with Tongues, &c.* bestow'd upon the Apostles and other Ministers of the Gospel, were but *particular* Operations in some, of the *Universal* pouring forth of the Spirit *upon all*, which Spirit, as saith the Apostle, *divideth unto every Man severally as he will*. Wherefore they greatly err, who would limit the Spirit of God, which *worketh all in all*, to its own *particular* Operations upon *some*. For tho' there are *Diversities of Operations* to qualify each Member of the Body for its *proper* and *peculiar* Service, yet, *The Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every Man to profit withal*, Verse 7. Or, as the Apostle again expresses it Verse 17, *By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body*: Whence we think it may justly be inferr'd, that every Man who is *profited*, or made better by the *Manifestation of the Spirit* given to him, is *baptized with the Holy Ghost*; and consequently, that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost consists not in the Power of working Miracles, speaking with Tongues, &c. but in the *Purification of the Heart, the cleansing of the Soul from Sin*, according to that of the Apostle 1 Cor. vi. 11. *But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God*.

The Sermon-Writer, pag. 12, cites *Acts* viii. 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, to shew, that some "after they
" had been *baptized in the Name of the Lord*, re-
" ceived the Gift of the *holy Ghost*." And *Acts* x.
44, 45, 46, to shew that *the Holy Ghost fell on others*
before

before they were baptized with Water. Both which Texts do sufficiently make appear that *Water-Baptism* had no Relation to the Gift of the *Holy Ghost*. By the former of them 'tis plain, that the *Samaritans* who had been baptized with Water had not received the *Holy Ghost*: And by the *Latter* it appears, that *Cornelius* and those with him had received the *Holy Ghost* before they were baptized with Water: Both of them shew, that the Gift of the *Holy Ghost* was not conveyed by the Means of *Water-Baptism*, but by the Preaching and Prayers of the Apostles. While Peter yet spake, the *Holy Ghost* fell on all them that heard the Word. This clearly denotes that the Baptism of the *Holy Ghost* was that which accompanied the Preaching of Peter, and not *Water-Baptism*. That the Ceremony of *Water-Baptism* was afterward administred to them, seems to have been but a prudential Circumstance in Order to the Admission of those early Converts into the *Jewish* Church, at a Time when the believing Brethren were *Jews*, and many of them so tenacious of the Ceremonial Law, as to think, that unless the *Gentiles* were, not only baptized with Water, that being one of the Rites of Initiation in Use among the *Jews*, but even Circumcised, and obliged to keep the Law of *Moses*, they could not be saved. See *Acts* xv. And 'tis observable, that the Apostle Peter when he rehearſes this Affair to the Brethren of the Circumcision at *Jerusalem*, mentions not a Word relating to the Ceremony of *Water-Baptism*, or the Administration of it.

This Author also cites, *Acts* xix. 4, 5, 6. and thereupon observes, pag. 12. “ that when Paul had
 “ rectified the Mistake of *John's* Disciples, that
 “ then they were baptized in the Name of the Lord
 “ *Jesus*; after which the Apostle laid his Hands on
 “ them, and the *Holy Ghost* came on them, and they
 spake

spake with Tongues and Prophefied." What he means by saying that "*Paul* had rectified the Mistake of "*some of John's Disciples,*" he hath not well explained. Nor does it appear to us what their Error was, unless that having valued themselves upon their *Water-Baptism*, the Apostle shews them how insufficient that was without the *Holy Ghost*. For this Text gives no just Ground to conclude that the Apostle did baptize them again with Water. The exprets Words of the Text are, *When they heard this, they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus : And when Paul had laid his Hands on them, the Holy Ghost came on them.* From which latter Words, being explicative of the Former, it appears, that the *Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus* here spoken of, was that of the *Holy Ghost* : But this Author, to make the Text speak his Sense, has exercised a little Piece of Fraud, by changing the Words, *and when,* into *after which.* A Liberty he sometimes indulges himself in, when the inspired Writers don't speak as he would have them.

He pretends, pag. 13, " to shew the End and " Design of our Lord in conferring these Gifts " upon the Apostles." That the peculiar Gifts conferr'd on the Apostles and others, were diverse Operations of the universal pouring forth of the Spirit, we have before shewn : And the same Spirit which the Father promised to pour forth upon all Flesh, was the *Spirit of Truth, the Comforter, the Guide into all Truth*, which Christ assured his Disciples the Father would give, *that he might abide with them for ever.* By this *Spirit of Truth*, were the Apostles endued with Power from on high to qualify them for the Work whereunto they were called. But this Author's Assertion, pag. 14, that " this " Divine Endowment was to be their Comforter, " Assister and Leader into all Truth," is erroneous,

in ascribing to the Gift or Endowment those Offices of Comforter, and Guide into all Truth, which our Saviour expressly ascribes to the Giver, *viz.* the *Spirit of Truth* it self, which abideth a *Comforter*, a *Leader*, and a *Teacher* for ever, not of the Apostles only, but of all Men, revealing to every Man the Knowledge of his Duty, and of whatsoever is necessary for his present and future Happiness. The Apostles did not recommend Men to any divine Endowment of theirs as their Teacher, but to the Spirit of Truth it self. The Excellency of the Gospel Dispensation consists in its being the *Ministration of the Spirit*. The express Terms of the New Covenant are, *After those Days, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward Parts, and write it in their Hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my People: And they shall teach no more every Man his Neighbour and every Man his Brother, saying, Know the Lord, for they shall all know me from the least of them even unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord.* Jer. xxxi. 33, 34. *All thy Children shall be taught of the Lord.* Isaiah liv. 13. To this inward Teacher did the Apostles direct, *Ye have, saith the beloved Disciple, an Unction from the holy One,* 1 John ii. 20. *The Anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any Man teach you, but as the same Anointing teacheth you of all Things, and is Truth and is no Lie; and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him,* Verse 27.

From the Consideration of all which we may clearly see, that the End and Design of the Apostles being *endued with Power from on high* was, that they might be “able Ministers of the New Testament,” not of the Letter, but of the Spirit, that they might be instrumental not only “for the Conviction of Sinners,” but for their Conversion, *viz.* *to open their Eyes and to turn them from Darknes to Light, and from the Power of Satan unto God, that they*
may

may receive *Forgiveness of Sins, and Inheritance among them that are sanctified by Faith that is in Jesus Christ.* *Acts* xxvi. 18. This was the Commission which the Apostle *Paul* testifies that he received from Christ: In which *Sanctification* is ascribed to *Faith*, and *Forgiveness of Sins* to the *Conversion of the Sinner* from *Darkness to Light*. Now considering here is no Mention of *Water-Baptism*, and the same Apostle in another Place expressly says, *Christ sent me not to baptize*, 'tis plain that *Water-Baptism* was no Part of his Commission: And considering that he reckons himself *not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles*, his Commission must have been as extensive as any of theirs. The clear Consequence of which is, that *Water Baptism* was not any Part of their Commission, nor intended in *Mat.* xxviii. 19.

The Sermon-Writer proceeds, pag. 15, to his *third Head, viz.* "to observe what might be the
" probable Reasons why the Disciples were *to tarry*
" at Jerusalem *untill they were endued with Power*
" *from on high.*" We shall have no Controversy with him on this Head; but shall acknowledge that his *probable Reasons* have more Truth in them than his *positive Assertions*, for in them we have found him frequently mistaken. We agree with him when he says, pag. 16, that "there was very great and
" good Reasons" why the Disciples *should tarry at Jerusalem.*

He comes, pag. 16, to his *fourth Head*, and says,
" I will now go on to trace the Apostles in their
" Doctrine and Practice, being thus *endued with*
" *Power from on high*, to teach and direct Mankind
" the Knowledge of their Duty, in Obedience to
" God under this Dispensation." But before he proceeds, he thinks proper to observe something by the Way, which is, that the Apostles "are not

“ now to be considered barely as Men, but as
 “ Persons completely qualified and furnished of
 “ God, to shew unto others *the Way of Life and*
 “ *Salvation*, and as such were faithful to the Trust
 “ reposed in them, so that what they taught and re-
 “ commended to Mankind to practise and observe,
 “ may be deemed as the *Oracles of God*, they being
 “ led by the Operation and Dictates of the Spirit
 “ of Truth, and were such who had an Extraordi-
 “ nary Measure thereof, they being baptized there-
 “ with.”

These last Words of his seem to limit the being
baptized with the Spirit, to such a Measure thereof
 as the Apostles had: But if he will consult the
 Apostle *Paul* in this Matter, he shall find, *1 Cor.*
xii. that all the Members of the *One Body* are bap-
 tized by *One Spirit*; and that he to whom the Spirit
 hath given *Faith*, (a Gift common to all Believers)
 is said to be *baptized by the Spirit*, as well as those
 to whom the Gifts of Healing, or of working Mira-
 cles, are given.

He tells us, that “ the Apostles are not now to
 “ be considered barely as Men,” but ’tis hoped he
 will allow us to consider them as *Men* qualified for
 the Preaching of the Gospel; and yet at the same
 Time that he will permit us to believe *Barnabas* and
Paul saying, *We also are Men of like Passions with*
you. Acts xiv. 15. and to consider them as such; for,
 tho’ they were *great and good Men*, inspired and *en-*
dued with Power from on high, yet they could not
 endure to be idoliz’d. They were faithful Men,
 qualified to teach others whatsoever the Spirit of
 Christ had taught them. *Be ye, saith Paul, Followers*
of me, as I also am of Christ, 1 Cor. xi. 1. Thus far
 the Example of the Apostles is binding upon others.
 But,

But, as * Dr. *Stillfleet* well observes, “ Nothing “ can make Scripture Examples of perpetual Obligation, but the Moral Nature of the Action, or a “ positive Law.” The Sermon-Writer acknowledges, (pag. 9.) that *Water-Baptism* is not a moral Duty, but he calls it a Duty of a positive Nature, tho’ he produces not any positive Law or Command to enforce its perpetual Obligation. The Practice of the Apostles, who were *Jews*, doth not make the Rites or Ceremonies of the *Jewish Religion* obligatory upon all *Christians* : The Apostle *Paul*’s Practice of Purifying himself after the Manner of the *Jews*, *Acts* xxi. 26. doth not oblige *Christians* so to do. His Practice in Circumcising *Timothy*, doth not oblige us to be Circumcised. And by the like Reason, if any of the Apostles practised *Water-Baptism*, which was a *Jewish* Ceremony, their Practice is no Rule for *Christian* Imitation.

We shall next take Notice of the Texts produced by the Sermon-Writer, to prove *Water-Baptism* a *Gospel Ordinance*.

The first of which is, *Acts* ii. 38, *Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost.* This Text as we have before observ’d, (pag 12.) makes no Mention of Water, the Word *baptized* in this Place may well denote the Cleansing of the Heart, or Conversion of the Soul to God. This Interpretation of the Word is such as the Apostle *Peter* himself hath given it, in a Text exactly parallel in the next Chapter, when speaking to the People in *Solomon’s* Porch, he says, *Repent ye therefore*

* *Weapon Salve*, pag. 77.

fore and be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out, when the Times of Refreshing shall come from the Presence of the Lord, *Acts* iii. 19. Wherefore this Author's intruding *Water* into a Text, which makes no Mention of any, shews that he is Wise beyond what is written, and prefers his own Sense to the Apostle's Interpretation, by which it appears, that the "two
 " Duties recommended to the Heart prick'd Jews, were, first, REPENTANCE, and, secondly, THE CONVERSION OF THE HEART TO GOD; the Consequence of which would be, *Remission of Sins and the Gift of the Holy Ghost*, or the *Refreshing of the Holy Spirit*, the Comforter which Christ had promised. Seeing then that *Remission of Sins and the Gift of the Holy Ghost*, are not the Consequence of *Water-Baptism*, 'tis evident that *Water-Baptism* was not the Baptism enjoined in this Text. Is it not then great Arrogance and Presumption in this Sermon-Writer, to assume to himself a Power to set aside the Gospel Duty of *Conversion of the Heart*, which the Apostle hath joined with *Repentance*, and to substitute *Water-Baptism*, a Jewish Ceremony, in its Stead? From what hath been said, we apprehend it will clearly appear, that this Author has no sufficient Warrant from *Acts* ii. 38. to say, that the Apostle advised to the Baptism of Water, nor any Authority from thence to conclude, that *Water-Baptism* is a Gospel Ordinance. Doth not he himself acknowledge, pag. 20, that "to be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ" doth signify a Belief in him and his Authority?" 'Tis to this Belief or Faith in Jesus Christ purifying the Heart, that the Scripture ascribes *Remission of Sins and Salvation*, *Acts* x. 43, To him give all the Prophets witness, that thro' Faith in his Name, whosoever believeth on him shall receive Remission of Sins. *Acts* xv. 9. Purifying their Hearts by Faith. This Purification of the Heart by Faith is the Gospel Baptism. *Mark* xvi. 17. He that believeth and is baptized shall

shall be saved. John vi. 47, *He that believeth on me hath everlasting Life.* Acts xvi. 31, *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.* The Drift and Tendency of the Ministry of the Apostles was to publish to all Mankind Remission of Sins thro' Repentance and Faith in Jesus Christ. What they declare to be the Consequence of Faith, this Author attributes to *Water-Baptism*, which he is pleased to call an *Ordinance of Christ*, while yet he is not able to shew that ever Christ did ordain it.

The next Text which he produces in Proof that *Water-Baptism* is an *Ordinance of Christ*, is Acts viii. 12. *When they (the Samaritans) believed Philip, preaching the Things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both Men and Women.* This "Baptism (says he, pag. " 21.) is evident from the Text to be the Baptism " of Water." Now suppose that be granted him, yet it is as evident from the Context, that the Baptism there spoken of was not attended either with *Remission of Sins*, or *the Gift of the Holy Ghost*, and consequently was not the *true Christian Baptism*.

The Case of *Simon the Samaritan* plainly shews, that *Water-Baptism* is not the *Baptism of Christ*. For *Christ's Baptism* doth not leave Men *in the Gall of Bitterness*, and *in the Bond of Iniquity*, in which *Simon* still continued notwithstanding his having been baptized with Water. The Case of the other *Samaritans* shews, how little they were benefited by *Water-Baptism*, which, tho' said to be *in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, was not accompanied with the Gift of the Holy Ghost: whence 'tis plain, that the formal Administration of that Ceremony availeth little, and that Men may pass under that Ceremony without being *baptized* with the Baptism of Christ. It were to be wished that all who practise *Water-Baptism* would seriously consider of this, I say, that they
would

would seriously consider that the *Samaritans*, notwithstanding their outward Assent to the Doctrine of *Fbilib*, and their being *outwardly* baptized with *Water*, were not esteemed as perfect Converts to Christianity, till they were afterward *baptized* with the *Christian Baptism* by the Ministration of *Peter* and *John*, who, Verse 17, *laid their Hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost*. This Text then falls very short of proving *Water-Baptism* to be an Ordinance of Christ.

The Sermon-Writer (pag. 21) makes a Digression, saying, “ And here by the Way I would observe to the People called *Quakers*, that I am informed that the Word *In the Name* in the Text, *Acts* viii. 16, is in the Greek or Original, *Into*, as well as in the Commission of our Lord, where, on the Account of which, Mr. *Barclay* and *Dell*, declare, that *Water* is not intended, but the *Baptism of the Spirit*.”

Tho’ his Information, as to the Sameness of the Greek Word in this Text, may be true ; yet his own Assertion respecting *Barclay* and *Dell*, is not so : For altho’ those Authors do declare, that in *Mat.* xxviii. 19. *Water* is not intended, but the *Baptism of the Spirit*, yet ’tis not barely on the Account of the Word, *Into*, that they so declare : But ’tis on the Account of the Nature of *Christ’s Baptism*, which Christ himself distinguishes from the *Baptism of Water* ; and because that when Christ had so clearly distinguished between *John’s Baptism of Water* and his own *Baptism of the Spirit*, it must be absurd to suppose that his Commission should relate to *Water-Baptism*, which was that of *John*. And that *Water-Baptism* was not intended in Christ’s Commission to his Disciples, is apparent by their being commanded to wait for Power from on high to execute

execute it: For this Author has acknowledged, pag. 11, "that *Water-Baptism* is in Man's Power only to administer." What Need then could there be for their waiting to be *endued with Power from on high*, to qualify them to *baptize* with such a *Baptism* as was before in their own Power to administer?

So that the Force both of *Barclay's* and *Dell's* Argument doth not depend upon the Word *Into*, but is grounded on the Nature of *Christ's Baptism*, and on the scriptural Signification of the *Name of the Lord*, denoting his *Virtue and Power*, which accompanies the Baptism of the Spirit, and not a meer formal Repetition of Words as us'd by those who administer *Water-Baptism*.

Those Authors, who probably were as Learned as this Writer's Informer, were not ignorant, that the same *Greek Word* may be rendred *In* or *Into*, also *to*, *for*, *by*, *at*, &c. according as the Scope and Purport of the Text in which it is used may require. And accordingly, they having proved that *Mat. xxviii. 19.* must be understood of the *Baptism of the Spirit*; they shew that the *Greek Word* in that Text ought to be rendred *into*, but they no where say, that *where ever the same Word occurs* "in the Original, it *must be understood* the same Way." That is only an imaginary Consequence of this Sermon-Writer's own drawing, which he introduces with an *If So*, pag. 22. and which indeed is *Not So*. Let him again consult his Informer, and if he understands the Original, he will probably satisfy him, that the same Particle in the *Greek Tongue* may have a different Construction in different Texts, agreeable to the Diversity of the Subject treated on. The Ignorance of which has led this Author to conceive a Necessity of such a Method of Translation as neither is nor ought to be practised. So that the *confused*

Work and Perplexity he talks of, has no Existence but in his own Imagination, and Misapprehension, concerning a Matter wherein he appears to be void of Understanding.

The next Text produc'd by the Sermon-Writer, is *Acts* viii. 32, 33, &c. relating the Passage of *Philip's* baptizing the *Ethiopian Eunuch*. From which Passage it were more easy to demonstrate, that *Water-Baptism* was a *Jewish Rite*, than that it is an Ordinance of the Gospel. The Text it self clearly shews that this Baptism was administred at the Instance and Request of the *Eunuch*, who was a *Gentile*, and the first Convert to *Christianity* from among the *Gentiles*, that we read of. He probably knowing *Water-Baptism* to be a Rite or Ceremony used in order to an Admission into the *Jewish Church*, within the Limits of which all the *Christians* at that Time seem to have been included, might desire to be so baptized: And for the same Reason *Philip*, being himself a Member of the *Jewish Church*, might administer that Ceremony to gratify the Request of his new Convert. For it doth not appear that there was at that Time any *Christian Church* wholly distinct or separate from the *Jewish*. So that *Philip's* administering to the *Eunuch* at his Request an usual *Jewish Ceremony*, in order to his Admission into that Church of which *Philip* himself and all other *Christians* at that Time were Members, doth in no wise prove *Water-Baptism* to be an Ordinance of Christ. It ought also to be considered that there were at that Time many of the Believers so tenacious of the Ceremonial Law, as to think, that unless the *Gentiles* were not only baptized with Water, but even Circumcised, and obliged to keep the Law of *Moses*, they could not be saved. See *Acts* xv. This Author may with equal Reason infer from *Paul's* Circumcising *Timothy*, that Circumcision is an Ordinance of Christ,

Christ, as he can conclude from *Philip's* Baptizing the *Eunuch*, that *Water-Baptism* is so. He tells us, that the Consequence of *Philip's* Preaching, was the *Eunuch's* Proposing, and being accordingly baptiz'd in Water : And might he not as well have told us, that the Consequence of *Timothy's* going forth with *Paul*, was, that he took and Circumcised him ? From such particular Instances as these, no general Conclusion can be drawn. But we may here observe what vain Deceit this Author exercises to scrue the Text to his own Purpose ; and at the same Time has the Assurance to tell his Reader, that his forc'd Construction is “ very Natural.” He asserts, “ *First*, that *Philip* had not only been Preaching “ Christ to be the true Messiah, but had also laid “ before the *Eunuch* those Things that concerned his “ Kingdom ” Now these last Words are his own Addition to the Text, by which he would insinuate, that *Philip* had preached *Water-Baptism* as a Thing that concerned the Kingdom of Christ : And from this Perversion of his own, says, “ Secondly, the Consequence of *Philip's* thus Preaching “ ing was the *Eunuch's* Proposing, and being accordingly baptized in Water.” Whereas the Consequence of *Philip's* Preaching was the *Eunuch's* believing in *Jesus* whom *Philip* had preached unto him : His being baptized with Water was purely at his own Request, and it no where appears that *Philip* had preached any Thing to him concerning that Ceremony : “ Thirdly, (says he) all this was carried “ on and conducted by the Angel and Spirit of “ God, and ended in the Joy and Rejoycing of the “ *Eunuch*.” And yet the Text makes no Mention that the Angel or Spirit of God gave any Directions concerning the Baptizing the *Eunuch* with Water. 'Twas Cause to him of Rejoycing that he believed in Christ, and that he was by *Water-Baptism* become a Member of the Jewish Church as other Christians

then were. For the Temple and Worship of the *Jews* was still in being, and the Ceremonies of that Religion not yet laid aside, but occasionally practised even by the Apostles themselves. But their Practice of those Ceremonies at that Time doth not make them of perpetual Obligation, nor to become Ordinances of Christ. The Baptism which accompanies *true Faith* is the Purification of the Heart, or *Baptism* of the *Holy Ghost*. This was the Baptism of which *Peter* speaks, when rehearsing the Conversion of the *Gentiles* by his Ministry, he says, *God which knoweth the Hearts, bare them Witness, giving them the Holy Ghost even as he did unto us : And put no Difference between us and them, purifying their Hearts by Faith. Acts xv. 8, 9.* And 'tis observable, that in the several Accounts this Apostle gives of the Conversion of *Cornelius* and his Company, he makes no Mention at all of their being baptized with Water ; but insists upon their being baptized with the Holy Ghost, and the Purification of their Hearts by Faith. *As I began to speak, (saith Peter) the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the Beginning. Then remembred I the Word of the Lord, how that he said, JOHN indeed baptized with Water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.* By which 'tis manifest that they were then baptized with Christ's Baptism according to his Ordinance or Appointment : Wherefore to assert that *Water-baptism* is an Ordinance of Christ, is to ascribe to him at one and the same Time two Baptisms, *One* of the *Spirit*, and the *other* of *Water*, in Contradiction to the express Distinction of our Saviour himself rehearsed by *Peter*, and to the Testimony of the Apostle, *One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, Eph. iv. 5.* The Apostle *Peter's* commanding those *Gentiles* to be baptized with *Water*, appears to us of no more Force, than his *not only* commanding, but *compelling the Gentiles to live as do the Jews. Gal. ii. 14.*

Now,

Now, if from *Peter's* commanding those Persons to be baptized, it did (as this Author, pag. 24, says) “ abundantly appear, That *Water-Baptism* is an Ordinance of Christ.” Will it not as abundantly appear, by his *compelling the Gentiles to live as do the Jews*, that it was an Ordinance of Christ that they should so live. This Manner of urging the Practice of the Apostles, who were *Jews*, as a Proof that whatever they did was an Ordinance of Christ, and obliging to all *Christians*, has a Tendency to re-establish the *Ceremonies* of the *Mosaick Law*, and to build again the Things which the Gospel of Christ hath abolished.

He yet produces another Text, viz. *Acts xix. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.* which relates, *that Paul came to Ephesus, and finding certain Disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's Baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the Baptism of Repentance, saying unto the People, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his Hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with Tongues and prophesied.* This Text which plainly shews the Invalidity of *Water-Baptism*, and in what a State of Ignorance Men may be notwithstanding their having submitted to that Ceremony, is by him produced to prove, that the Apostle *Paul* did again baptize those Persons with *Water*; altho' the Text does not say so, nor indeed is it probable that the Apostle should re-baptize them with the Baptism of *Water*, which they had already experienced to be so ineffectual. These Words, *they were*
baptized

baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus, seem in this Place to denote the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, and to be so explained by the next Words, *viz. And when Paul had laid his Hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them.* So that this Text which he produces to prove *Water-Baptism* a Gospel Ordinance, is so far from answering his Purpose, that it doth not prove the Apostle's administering to those Persons any *Water-Baptism* at all. Wherefore this Author acts most preposterously in pretending, pag. 25, to shew wherein "*John's* and *CHRIST's* Baptism with "*Water* differed," while yet he hath not made appear that *CHRIST* did ever baptize with *Water*, or commission his Disciples so to do. And altho' it appears and may be granted him, that *Paul* in some few Instances did administer *Water-Baptism*, yet we have his own exprefs Testimony that *Christ sent him not* on that Errand. 1 Cor. i. 17.

The Sermon-Writer's next Attempt is, pag. 25, to wrest the Words of *William Dell*, (whom he miscalls *Eminent Quaker*) who says, "that in the primitive Church they had the Doctrine of Baptisms in the plural Number," and of *Thomas Lawson*, who says, "Here the plural Number shews forth the "*Outward* and *Inward* Baptism," to a Sense directly contrary to that of those Authors, who plainly shew from Holy Scripture, that the *Outward Baptism* or *Baptism with Water*, was the Baptism of *John*, not of *CHRIST*; and that the *Inward Baptism* or *Baptism of the Spirit* was the Baptism of *CHRIST*, not of *John*: And that the *Inward Baptism* or *Baptism of the Spirit*, is the *One* and *only* Baptism abiding in Force under the Gospel Dispensation. This was that Baptism which accompanied the Preaching of the Gospel by the Apostles; *While Peter yet spake, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the Word, Acts x. 43.* the ~~Effect~~ of which was the purifying
their

their Hearts by Faith, Acts xv. 9. Their Preaching, which was in the Demonstration of the Spirit and with Power, reached to the Hearts of the Hearers, to the Conviction and Conversion of Sinners, and turning them from Darkness to Light : Thus were they instrumental in the Hand of God, through the Power of the Spirit attending their Ministry, to purge the Consciences of the Hearers from dead Works, and to wash away their Sins by the Baptism of the Spirit, or *Washing of Regeneration and the Renewing of the Holy Ghost.* So that the *Doctrine of Baptisms*, which in the Primitive Church was esteemed a *Principle* of Christianity and tending to Perfection, was that very *Doctrine* which *John the Baptist*, and our Saviour himself, had taught respecting *Baptism*, *Mat. iii. 11. Acts i. 5*, where they make a most plain Distinction and Separation between *Water-Baptism* and the *Baptism with the Holy Ghost.* This distinguishing Doctrine seems to have been one of the *first Principles of the Oracles of God*, shewing forth the true Nature and Spirituality of the Gospel Dispensation, ascribing the *Baptism of Water*, which was but *Outward, Typical, and Temporary*, to the Dispensation of *John the Servant and fore-runner of Christ* ; and attributing the *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, which is *Inward, Substantial, and abiding for ever*, to the Dispensation of Christ himself, who is *Lord of all.* 'Tis indeed Matter of Admiration, that Persons who read the Scripture, and presume to teach others, should yet continue so *unskilful in the Word of Righteousness*, as to press the Observation of *Jewish Rites* under the Gospel Dispensation ; and 'tis Matter of Lamentation, that even unto this Day, when they read the New-Testament, *the Vail is upon their Hearts*, that they cannot *stedfastly look to the End of that which is abolished* : But are still continuing in the Observation of *Meats and Drinks and divers Washings, and Carnal Ordinances imposed until the*

the Time of Reformation, and which being but *Figures for the Time then present*, could not make him that did *the Service perfect as pertaining to the Conscience*, Heb. ix. 9, 10. By which Text 'tis apparent, that *Water-Baptism* was one of the *Carnal Ordinances imposed until the Time of Reformation*: “ If then (says R. Barclay. Apol. pag. 425) the Time of Reformation, or the Dispensation of the Gospel, which puts an End to the Shadows, be come, then such Baptisms or Carnal Ordinances are no more to be imposed.” And indeed had Christ given *Water-Baptism* in Commission to his Disciples, and so perpetuated the Use of it, with what Propriety could the Apostle afterward have call'd it *A Carnal Ordinance*, and only *imposed untill the Time of Reformation*? Had Christ enjoyned his Apostles to practise *Water-Baptism*, can it be thought that the Apostle Paul would have disclaimed the Practice, have thanked God that he baptized no more, and have expressly declared, that *Christ sent him not to baptize*? By which it plainly appears that the Apostles Practice of a Thing, doth not necessarily prove that they did it in pursuance of Christ's Commission: So that although the Apostles did practise *Water-Baptism*, *Circumcision*, *Legal Purifications*, and other *Jewish Rites* for a Season, yet, we cannot think that this Sermon-Writer has assigned any sufficient Reason from their Practice of *Water-Baptism* to justify his Conclusion, pag. 27, “ that the Apostles did thus understand their Lord in his Commission,” or that they “ practised *Water-Baptism* in Obedience thereto.”

We apprehend that the Observations we have made, may suffice to shew the Emptiness of this Author's Discourse, and how very far he has fallen short of what he proposed, viz. “ to prove that *Water-Baptism* is an Ordinance of the Gospel Church.”

He

He appears sensible, pag. 27, that the *Quakers* " have Objections which he has not taken Notice " of," but (says he) I rather chuse, and think it " most proper, if they should be so disposed, for " them first to offer these Things themselves.

This shews his Opinion of himself, and of his Abilities to answer the *Quakers* Objections : But their Sentiments of him are very different ; for the Reading of his Sermon has plac'd him as low in their Eyes as he is exalted in his own ; so that tho' they have condescended to take some Notice of his Performance, in order to prevent honest Men's being impos'd on by his Guile ; yet they do not lay their Objections before him with a View of any Solution of them from a Person whom they esteem altogether unqualified for that Purpose.

To conclude, we cannot recommend to our Readers a more sovereign Remedy against such a Discourse as his is, than the Exhortation given by himself, pag. 27, viz. "*that they be always careful that they are not tossed to and fro, and carried about by every Wind of Doctrine, by the Sleight of Men, and cunning Craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive,*" while under the specious Pretence of Christian Ordinances, they would lead Men back again to the Observation of Rites and Ceremonies long since abolished by the Gospel of Christ. Against such Deceivers as these, the Apostle expressly cautions the Believers, *Gal. i. 5. Stand fast therefore in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled again with the Yoke of Bondage.*

As he closes his Sermon with his own Interpretation of *1 Pet. iii. 20, 21*, we shall also close our Observations with the following Interpretation of the same Text, taken from *R. Barclay's Apology*, pag.

419, 420, 421, and shall leave to the Judgment of the Impartial Reader to determine, whether of those Interpretations is more agreeable to the Nature of true Christianity and the Doctrine of the Gospel.

“ *Fourthly, (saith Robert Barclay) That the One*
 “ *Baptism of Christ* is not a washing with Water,
 “ appears from 1 Pet. iii. 21, *The like Figure where-*
 “ *unto, even Baptism, doth also now save us, (not the*
 “ *putting away of the Filth of the Flesh, but the An-*
 “ *swer of a good Conscience towards God) by the Resur-*
 “ *rection of Jesus Christ* : So plain a Definition of
 “ *Baptism* is not in all the Bible ; and therefore,
 “ seeing it is so plain, it may well be preferred to
 “ all the coined Definitions of the School-men. The
 “ Apostle tells us, First, *Negatively*, what it is not,
 “ viz. *Not a putting away of the Filth of the Flesh* ;
 “ then surely it is not a *Washing* with Water, since
 “ that is so. Secondly, he tells us affirmatively what
 “ it is, viz. *The Answer of a good Conscience towards*
 “ *God, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* : Where
 “ he affirmatively defines it to be the Answer (or
 “ *Confession*, as the *Syriack* Version hath it) of a good
 “ *Conscience*. Now this *Answer* cannot be but where
 “ the Spirit of God hath purified the Soul, and
 “ the Fire of his Judgment hath burned up the Un-
 “ righteous Nature : And those in whom this Work
 “ is wrought, may be truly said to be *baptized with*
 “ *the Baptism of Christ*, i. e. of the Spirit and of
 “ *Fire*. Whatever Way then we take this Definition
 “ of the Apostle, of *Christ's Baptism*, it confirmeth
 “ our Sentence ; for if we take the first or Negative
 “ Part, viz. *That it is not a putting away of the Filth*
 “ *of the Flesh*, then it will follow, that *Water-Bap-*
 “ *tism* is not it ; since, as our Adversaries will not
 “ deny, *Water-Baptism* doth not always imply it,
 “ neither is it any necessary Consequence thereof.
 “ Moreover, the Apostle in this Place doth seem
 “ especially to guard against those that might
 “ esteem

“ esteem *Water-Baptism* the true *Baptism of Christ*,
 “ because (left by the Comparison induced by him
 “ in the preceding Verse, betwixt the Souls that
 “ were saved in *Noah's Ark*, and us, that are now
 “ saved by Baptism; lest, I say, any should have
 “ thence hastily concluded, that because the former
 “ were saved by *Water*, this Place must needs be
 “ taken of *Water-Baptism*) to prevent such a
 “ Mistake, he plainly affirms, that it is not that,
 “ but another Thing. He saith not, that it is the
 “ *Water*, or the putting away of the Filth of the Flesh,
 “ as accompanied with the Answer of a good Con-
 “ science; whereof the One, viz. *Water*, is the Sacra-
 “ mental Element, administred by the Minister; and
 “ the other, the Grace or Thing signified, conferred by
 “ Christ; but plainly, That it is not the putting
 “ away, &c. Moreover *Peter* calls this here which
 “ saves, the *Ἀντίτυπον*, the *Antitype*, or the Thing
 “ figured, whereas it is usually translated, as if the
 “ like Figure did now save us; thereby insinuating,
 “ that as they were saved by Water in the Ark, so
 “ are we now by *Water-Baptism*. But this Inter-
 “ pretation crosseth his Sense, he presently after
 “ declaring the Contrary, as hath above been
 “ observed. And likewise it would contradict the
 “ Opinion of all our Opposers. For *Protestants*
 “ deny it to be absolutely necessary to Salvation:
 “ And tho' *Papists* say, *None are saved without it*;
 “ yet in this they admit an Exception, as of *Mar-*
 “ *tyrs*, &c. and they will not say, that all that
 “ have it, are saved by *Water-Baptism*; which they
 “ ought to say, if they will understand by *Baptism*,
 “ (by which the Apostle saith, *we are saved*,) *Wa-*
 “ *ter-Baptism*. For seeing we are saved by *this Bap-*
 “ *tism*, as all those that were in the Ark were saved
 “ by *Water*, it would then follow, that all those
 “ that have this *Baptism*, are saved by it. Now
 “ this Consequence would be false, if it were under-
 “ stood

“ stood of *Water-Baptism*, because many, by the
 “ Confession of all, are *baptized with Water*, that
 “ are not saved: But this Consequence holds most
 “ true, if it be understood as we do, of the *Baptism*
 “ of the *Spirit*; since none can have this Answer
 “ of a good Conscience, and abiding in it, not be
 “ saved by it.”

This Interpretation of *Robert Barclay* seems to us plain and clear: Not like that of this Sermon-Writer, when he tells us, pag. 28, that “ the Apostle doth distinguish between the *Act of this Gospel*, “ and *figurative Baptism*,” which unscriptural and obscure Phrases seem adapted to keep his Reader as *Ignorant* of his *Meaning*, as he himself is of the *Subject* he pretends to treat on. That the *Vail*, which seemeth unto us to be upon his Mind, may be removed, we exhort him with full Purpose of Heart to turn unto the Lord, and to the-Inshinings of the Light of Christ in himself, which only can enable him to distinguish aright between the Shadow and the Substance of Religion; between Ritual and External Ceremonies, and real and internal Purity: Between Bodily Exercise which profiteth little, and the *Worshipping of God* in Spirit and in Truth. For notwithstanding he may have assumed to himself the Office of *Teaching others*, yet he had need that One teach him again which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God. That he may stand open to the Reception of sound Doctrine, it becometh him to observe the Caution of the Apostle, *Rom. xii. Not to be wise in his own Conceit, nor to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly; and always to be mindful that God resisteth the Proud, but giveth Grace unto the Humble, James iv. 6.*

F I N I S.

